DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 961 JC 700 118

AUTHOR Sobel, Irvin; Hilgert, Raymond L.
TITLE The Junior College District of St. Louis-St. Louis County: A Socio-Economic Profile.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 67
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.40
DESCRIPTORS *Institutional Research, *Junior Colleges, *Student College Relationship, Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS Missouri

ABSTRACT

Recommendations leading to better counseling and preparation of St. Louis Junior College District (Missouri) students are the focus of this research project. Data were obtained by interviewing students, their parents, faculty, and counselors on each of the three campuses, in addition to local high school counselors. The responses of these groups to a series of unstructured questions resulted in recommendations that include the following: (1) basing subsequent planning and administration of programs on the existing differences in general socio-economic status and academic qualifications of the student body on each campus; (2) giving more directive counseling at both the high school and junior college level, increasing faculty guidance, and expanding parental familiarity with existing programs and goals, thus encouraging more students to enroll in courses for which they are best suited; (3) increasing and improving communication with state college and university officials to facilitate proper course preparation for students ultimately planning to transfer after junior college; and (4) clarifying the goals and objectives of the district so that counselors, administrators, and faculty members can coordinate their efforts toward their common aims. (JO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED038961

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT OF ST. LOUIS-ST. LOUIS COUNTY: A SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE

A Research Project Conducted Under A Grant

To Washington University By The Carnegie Corporation Foundation

Co-Directors of the Research Project:

Dr. Irvin Sobel, Professor of Economics,
Department of Economics, Washington University

Dr. Raymond L. Hilgert, Associate Professor
of Management, Graduate School of Business
Administration, Washington University

Copyright (C) 1967 by Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 05 1970

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC 700 118

CHAPTER I

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT OF ST. LOUIS - ST. LOUIS COUNTY RESEARCH STUDY: A FOREWORD

Introduction

The past decades have seen an intensified growth of higher educational institutions designed to serve basic community objectives and linked by design to the needs and aspirations of the sponsoring communities. One specific and perhaps the fastest growing type of community educational organization is that which is euphemistically labeled (oft-times somewhat curiously) as the Community Junior College. Proponents of this institutional two-year college equivalent form have justified its foundation and extension on the grounds that there were a broad and growing range of needs for "middle-level" manpower, - especially for trained technical personnel intermediate in skill between the craftsman and the professional, - which were not being met by other institutions of higher learning. Programs, locations, and costs (including opportunity costs) of attendance at other institutions rendered them beyond the reach of many segments of the population who could both benefit from and absorb certain types of education appropriate to their needs. By providing these segments of the population with a more visible and accessible educational alternative, not only would the particular individuals presumably be helped in terms of income, well being, and even civic responsibility, but the whole community would find its growth potential enhanced by its ability to attract or retain industry, whose

most rapidly growing sections are increasingly education and training oriented, and which require growing proportions of trained personnel.

While these are all commendable objectives, they are not attained automatically through the mere expenditure of resources in education. They must be reduced to specific magnitudes in terms of programming, curriculum courses, equipment, buildings, and types of personnel if the community is to bridge the gap between the vague, ill-defined objective of "need for education" and the payoff in terms of both individual and community growth. A Community College especially must operate within the constraint of a limited budget at a relative low average student cost, which imposes even greater pressure upon it to best allocate scarce and limited resources in a fashion which optimize the attainment of its objectives. Because communities and even different economic and residential segments of a given community differ in their size, in their industrial and occupation structure, in their goals and willingness to provide education, and in the number and variety of educational alternatives available, programs and emphasis will and must differ community by community. No one single formula, format, or institutional mold is consonant with maximum community service.

Objectives of this Study

The objectives of this research study were to analyze on both the supply and demand sides of the labor market those factors which could provide guides to the focus and emphasis for the three campuses of the St. Louis Junior College District. This initial and basic segment of the study primarily focused upon the <u>supply</u> side of the equation, namely, the full-time students who constitute the supply of potential graduates of the institution. Because of the nature of the problem, the basic

research was not confined alone to students; instead, it was equally focused upon parents, faculty, administration, counselors, and others who either influence choice or the institution's educational policy.

Subsequent analysis will deal with the types of technical and general competencies likely to be demanded by the area's economy; thus, both the nature of the current student body (supply) and the prospective occupational needs of the community (demand) will be explored. However, the former will constitute the major focus of the research embodied in this report.

Specific Questions

In order to move from vague generalities and provide a more precise formulation of the basic issues, the research attempted to provide answers for the following specific questions:

(1) To what extent and in what proportions do Junior College students and their parents see the Junior College as an alternative channel or even as a last chance for a four year degree type of education as opposed to a technical training entity to prepare them for middle manpower positions? Are their choices the same as those of their counselors or the faculty (presumably the professionals) in making such decisions?

(2) What are the views held by those who ostensibly make or influence student decisions as to the allocation of educational resources between various educational alternatives, including terminal technical training, and how do these proportions relate to the choices made by students?

(3) Given the amount of technological change and occupational mobility, how much of a trainable base of general education is necessary to provide for flexibility and adjustment to change?

(4) What socio-economic groups in the community is the Community College liable to serve? What are their aspirations and perceived needs, first in terms of the choices they make and secondly, in terms of what professionals deem desirable?

(5) What are the potential channels influencing choice (such as counseling) and how do they operate? Do these channels achieve any influence?

(6) What are the channels of recruitment open to the JCD? How are people influenced by the formal channels, especially counseling? What sort of counseling is provided about future occupational choices and educational prospects?

(7) What prevents individuals with the necessary aptitudes and abilities from availing themselves of this sort of education?

(8) What is the desired relation of the JCD to other educational institutions at both a higher and lower level? How do JCD students compare with those in other local institutions? How successful are they likely to be if they move into transfer type programs?

A forthcoming report on the occupational demand patterns concentrated in the technician areas will examine the following questions:

(1) What are the key and most important from a community growth standpoint technical and middle level manpower occupations which require specialized technical education and training beyond the high school and for which there exists a need for more and better trained personnel?

(2) What is the optimum allocation of resources in the training and education of such personnel between the JCD and the employer? Should the JCD provide more general and theoretical type of training, such as the provision of what may be termed a trainable base in a broad

family of technical fields (i.e., electronics technician), leaving the employer to give the specific training for the particular specialty or classification to be used?

The Study and Its Methodology

The supply part of this research study essentially was based upon an analysis of student records and upon relatively intensive interviews with samples of JCD students, their parents, JCD faculty and administrators, and high school and JCD counselors. The specific nature of the sample as well as the type of information sought from each category are described briefly below.

The Student Body Samples

The first set of data was obtained from samples of the student bodies in different types of local higher educational institutions. This data was necessary to determine the specific nature of those served by the Community Colleges and of the qualitative factors which are likely to differentiate it from the first two years of other local colleges and universities. The following randomly determined samples were drawn:

a) 480 records from students at the three Junior College campuses were selected for analysis. Such data as parental income levels, career aspirations, IQ's, courses pursued, occupations of parents, etc., were collected and tabulated. These were compared with randomly selected samples of local students from Washington University, St. Louis University and the University of Missouri at St. Louis.

b) About 300 JCD students (approximately 100 from each of the three campuses) were interviewed in-depth not only in regard to the variables indicated above, but also in the context of factors affecting their choice, perceptions of the Junior College, and other educational and training attitudes.

Parents

Interviews in-depth were conducted with 156 parents of the JCD students selected for interviews. These interviews concerned parental perceptions of opportunities for their children, the rationale of the decision-making process covering entry to the Junior College, and in general attempted to answer questions about parental influence upon educational and training decisions, as well as to yield insights into the role of free community sponsored education upon mobility.

High School Counselors

Guidance counselors in most of the area high schools were intensively interviewed. The objectives of these interviews were to elicit information about a counselor's role in influencing educational decisions, the amount of knowledge of both JCD programs and JCD curricula available to him, the types of students he counsels into the JCD, and the rationale of this professional activity.

JCD Faculty and JCD Counselors

A sample of 59 JCD faculty and academic administrators were interviewed in-depth. These interviews were designed to elicit information on the academic experience of the faculty, their perception of the Junior College, and their aspirations as to its future role and its likely pattern of development. Questions were asked about their evaluation of the student bodies and the apparent realism of the objectives of the students. Other questions were designed to establish the differences between what the educators conceived as an optimum allocation of resources and the educational resources pattern resulting from student choices.

Nineteen JCD Counselors comprising the entire population of such personnel were also interviewed intensively. Questions were

designed to establish the differences between what the educators conceived as an optimum allocation of resources and the educational resource pattern resulting from student choices.

The Approach

A study of this sort necessarily was somewhat exploratory in nature both in terms of methodology and in its attempt to establish criteria in a rather indeterminate and unquantified grey area of belief about norms and goals. Nevertheless, it was felt that broad guides to certain policy and progammatic decisions could eventuate. It was upon this basis, rather than upon an expectation of exactitude which would yield nicely calibrated allocative decisions at the margin, that this study was made.

The major field research began in the summer of 1965 and continued through the academic year, 1965 - 1966. The interviewing and data collection were conducted by Graduate Research Assistants from Washington University. Interviews with JCD students, their parents, JCD counselors, and faculty were conducted on the three campuses of the Junior College. The samples were randomly selected, and appointment interviews were scheduled with the cooperation and assistance of JCD administrative personnel at each campus. Interviews with high school counselors were conducted at the various high school locations by appointment with each of the counselors involved.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In a broad sense the objective of this research was to study the various "publics" who are the most influential in the Junior College District environment and to analyze the various forces, constraints, and perceptions which impinge upon their choices and decisions.

From such a research focus, certain conclusions have been drawn from the data, and these generalizations have given rise to a somewhat more speculative body of general recommendations concerning the future policies of the Junior College District of St. Louis - St. Louis County.

This final chapter, then, will attempt to briefly summarize and highlight some of the more significant findings of the research.

Specific findings drawn from each of the major population groups sampled will be summarized and their policy implications developed.

Qualifications

In order to place the conclusions of this study in perspective, certain facets of the research methodology and the emphasis of the analysis should be cited.

Firstly, the basic data emanated from interviews in which unstructured questions were asked the respondents. The essentially unstructured answers were analyzed for common classifications, a process which

enabled coding and quantification of the basic results. However, the unstructured comments remained as the basic core of the study, and this core was utilized as a basis for deriving certain generalizations which are not always specifically inherent in the quantitative evidence cited in the tabular data. The resultant qualitative generalizations enabled more meaningful interpretations as to the underlying reasons and rationale for the research results.

Secondly, the focus of this research was such as to primarily call attention to the problem areas and perhaps, consequently, to overestimate their relative importance. In a sense, analysis of this nature perhaps "accentuates the negative" and by the nature of the emphasis can infer certain invidious comparisons not directly supported by the research itself. But if the research had been comparatively oriented in terms of other community colleges or had cited similar research studies, a basic commonality of problems, both in terms of the socio-economic and intellectual qualifications of the student body and the ambivalence of the faculty, would likely to have been found.

Certainly of importance and at least equally meritorious of note are the important and undeniable indicators of progress and achievement of the JCD. In a period of only four short years, three campuses have been established; new facilities are under construction; a competent and constantly growing faculty has been recruited; and many innovating programs have been introduced. The JCD, as the data strongly indicates, is well accepted by the general community and by its four immediate "publics", i.e., students, faculties, counselors, and parents. The JCD already has been accepted as a major element of higher education in its area, offering opportunities to major segments of the population who otherwise would re-

main educationally deprived. An analysis of the literature about community colleges would indicate that in a relatively short period of time, the JCD has anticipated and confronted many of the problems that have vexed other institutions which have been established for a much longer period of time. For all of the accomplishments, the JCD faculty and administration are to be commended. But the problems which this study highlights point to challenges and opportunities which must be met if the JCD is to fulfill its role in the community.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Major substantive findings of this report for the appropriate sample groupings are as follows:

THE JCD STUDENT BODIES

1) There are significant differences in basic socio-economic characteristics between the student bodies at each of the three JCD campuses. By most socio-economic standards, the students at the Meramec campus rank highest, while those at the Forest Park campus rank lowest in terms of the same evaluatory criteria.

2) By comparison to other local universities, JCD students and their parents generally rank considerably lower according to the basic socio-economic measures used as comparative criteria.

3) By comparison to other local universities, the JCD attracts a disproportionate number of hitherto academically weak students and does not attract a proportionate number of those who by virtue of their previous records could be classified as academically superior. In fact, judged by the data from interviews and student records as to test scores and class rank, a substantial proportion of JCD students, - (probably more than the 10% postulated by JCD faculty and counselors), - seem to require remedial

instruction in order to bring them to a level of competence consonant with effective performance at the college level.

4) The majority (about three-fifths) of JCD students are employed at least part-time in addition to attending the JCD. By comparison to the other JCD campuses, - as could be expected from their lower average family incomes,- a significantly higher percentage of Forest Park students are employed on a full-time or near full-time basis. Thus, many Junior College students, especially those on the Forest Park campus, would be unable to attend a higher educational institution without some means of earning not only the direct costs of their education but also the much higher alternative cost of incomes which otherwise would have been foregone by their families.

5) Most JCD students view their attendance at the JCD as the first two years of their ultimate college education of four years or more. This is true even for a substantial proportion of those students registered in technical/vocational programs, who instead of regarding themselves as registered in terminal programs leading to employment as technicians or in middle-manpower capacities, actually conceive of themselves as being in the first two years of college preparatory for a professional career such as in engineering, or in business administration.

6) For the most part, JCD students report that they make the decisions both as to the choice of institution (selection of the JCD) and as to the type of program or course work that they will pursue at the JCD. The student interviewees did not assign their parents a major role in these decisions, and these conclusions were confirmed to an appreciable degree by their parents.

7) A large proportion of JCD students looked primarily to the JCD for college entrance and depended upon the "open-door" policy for admission. Despite their statements to the contrary as to other possible choices, a great deal of evidence strongly indicates that a large proportion of the students at the JCD would not have gone onward academically had the JCD not existed.

8) JCD students tend to be quite critical of the counseling they receive in their high schools. For the most part, counseling which they receive in high school is of a general nature, which they interpret as not being directed towards their specific individual needs.

9) The students interpret the counseling which they receive at the JCD as being basically more program and course oriented, than individual and individual career oriented.

10) Many JCD students have educational and career objectives which are inconsonant and unrealistic in relationship to either their academic and/or financial capabilities.

PARENTS

1) There are very real differences in the educational and other socio-economic status characteristics of the families served by each JCD campus. Again, families from the Meramec campus area generally rank the highest, those from the Forest Park campus area tend to rank the lowest in the criteria used for comparison. However, parents from each of the JCD campus areas generally rank lower in terms of education, occupation and income than other parents from the same areas sending their children to the other local universities.

2) Parental influence, while moderately substantial concerning the decisions of their offspring to enroll at the JCD, appears to be minimal

in regard to the JCD courses and specific programs in which their offspring enroll.

3) Parents tend to view the reasons for their son or daughter's enrollment at the JCD in terms of family financial necessity and/or academic deficiencies of their offspring. In this context, they are somewhat more realistic than their children, although they, too, are rather unwilling to concede that the JCD represented the only feasible alternative for college attendance.

4) Most parents of JCD students view the JCD in terms of the first two years of their son or daughter's college education. This observation is generally true for parents whose children are registered in technical/vocational programs as well as those with children in a college transfer program.

5) The majority of JCD parents know little specifically about the JCD, how it functions, about its courses and curricular alternatives, nor how it compares with other schools. At the same time, however, a substantial majority are quite satisfied with the JCD and its quality of education, although some parents have doubts about either its overall academic quality or the transferability of JCD courses.

6) Parents, for the most part, believe that the JCD is a reasonably good stepping-stone for their children, and they appreciate its existence in the St. Louis community. In fact, while in one part of the interviews they implied that in the absence of the JCD their children would have gone elsewhere, in other parts of the same interviews a high proportion likened the JCD to a "godsend" without which their offspring would not have had a chance to progress in our society.

HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS

1) Student-to-counselor ratios in most high schools, particularly city high schools from which most Forest Park students emanate, are quite high. The time allocation for counseling to most high school students appears to be rather meager, particularly for students in the city schools. The indications are that in many high schools, there is insufficient counseling time available for discussing fully numerous college and career alternatives, let alone any one to even a moderately full extent.

2) High school counselors view the JCD primarily in terms of technical/vocation education, financially low-cost education, and/or education for academically weak students.

3) Most high school counselors have a qualified favorable image of the JCD; yet, ambivalence is reflected in the fact that a substantial number of high school counselors consider the JCD to be a low prestige school to which they almost automatically counsel the academically least qualified students.

4) The influence of high school counselors appears to be:

a) substantial in terms of advising students to attend the JCD;

b) limited in terms of counseling students to attend specific technical/vocational programs or enrolling in the JCD college transfer program.

5) There appears to be a lack of sufficient information available to the high school counselors (at least in their opinion) concerning the various programs being offered at the JCD, and the types of capacities and capabilities necessary for students to succeed in them. This appears to be especially true concerning individual technical/vocational programs, about which little is known to some high school counselors who are more

attuned to conventional academic alternatives. The result is that general advice to a student to take a technical/vocational course is frequently negated by the inability of the counselor to strongly specify or even recommend which one or ones.

JCD COUNSELORS

1) Most JCD counselors believe that the resources of the JCD should be allocated in a "balanced" fashion, with about 40% of the JCD's resources in college transfer programs and about the same amount in technical/vocational education. About 10% of the JCD's resources, they contend, should be allocated to remedial efforts. These preferences differ markedly from what JCD students and their parents presently seem to prefer and choose.

2) JCD counselors display considerable ambivalence in their attitudes towards the JCD and in their beliefs concerning the JCD's image among students, parents, and the community.

3) JCD counselors view the student bodies of the JCD as being generally lower intellectually and socio-economically than those attending other universities in the community. Similarly, they generally believe that Forest Park ranks lowest in these areas of comparison among the three JCD campuses.

4) JCD counselors believe that many JCD students are unrealistic in course and career objectives. They attribute some of this to inadequate high school counseling. Nevertheless, they too, possibly because of time limitation problems, seem unwilling to be highly directive in their counseling.

5) In view of the magnitude of the various problems with which they are confronted,JCD counselors believe that additional counselors and counseling services are needed at the JCD.

JCD FACULTY

1) The JCD faculty manifested some diversity of viewpoint concerning the JCD's objectives and the relative allocation of JCD resources. In terms of broad averages, the faculty believe that the resources of the JCD should be allocated approximately as follows: college transfer programs, 40%; technical/vocational education, 40%; with the remainder divided between developmental (remedial) and community service programs.

2) There is a great degree of ambivalence in the minds of the JCD faculty concerning the objectives and image of the school. The majority of the faculty have positive attitudes towards the JCD, but at the same time they are quite concerned as to the status and prestige of the school and their role as faculty.

3) In the minds of the JCD faculty, there exists a type of socio-economic and academic status differential between the three campuses of the JCD. There also exists in the minds of the JCD faculty a comparison of the JCD with that of other local colleges and universities - and with their own academic norms and status symbols - which could be described as being an "unfavorable" one.

4) Most faculty believe that too many JCD students are unrealistic in their course and career choices.

5) The JCD faculty is committed to the "open-door" policy of the JCD, although the faculty partially recognizes the problems which this policy presents in terms of academically weaker students.

6) The JCD faculty believes that additional counselors and counseling services at the JCD would be helpful towards improving the academic climate and the overall programs at the JCD.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Many of the recommendations to be outlined in this final section of the report have been suggested at various stages in the analytical discussions of the preceding chapters. The authors recognize that the recommendations which are suggested and reiterated here are based upon a research study that admittedly was exploratory in nature. However, it is strongly believed that the ensuing findings which developed from a multi-group approach were generally consistent with what could be logically postulated and deduced from other studies of community colleges. Further, the findings demonstrated a pattern which leads the authors to have a high degree of confidence that the results are valid in a qualitative or directional sense.

Certainly, a very basic recommendation would be to point out the need for additional research that would more narrowly focus on some of the specific subject areas encompassed by this research, particularly the area of counseling. The potential usefulness of more specifically "pin-pointed" types of research could well make a great contribution to the planning and administrative functioning of the JCD.

The following recommendations summarize those aspects which the research would indicate as appropriate courses of action. Many of these recommendations are rather broad and only directional in nature, but they logically stem from the analysis of the research results summarized previously.

1) It is important for the Junior College District of St. Louis - St. Louis County to recognize that it does not have, nor should it consider having, a single overall uniform program for each of the three individual JCD campuses. There appear to be demonstrable differences

in the general socio-economic and even academic qualities of the students at each of the three campuses, which should be recognized and planned for accordingly. For example, a strong evening program should continue to be a major element of the Forest Park Community College program to facilitate the continuing education of the high percentage of Forest Park students who must work on a full-time or near full-time basis. In addition, a somewhat larger remedial program for Forest Park would also seemingly be indicated, while Meramec could undoubtedly represent the closest approximation of the first two years of "conventional" college. A further illustration of these differences is the need to enhance the counseling program particularly at the Forest Park campus, since the quality and quantity of high school counseling available appears to be the least adequate for students attracted to this campus.

This observation is not to be interpreted as saying that the three JCD campuses should not strive for as high a degree of relative uniformity in overall curriculum choices as possible. BUt it does imply that the planning and administration of each JCD campus must be acutely cognizant of the types of needs that are most likely to be present on each of the campuses due to the type of "segmentation" of academic and socio-economic status groupings that have developed over time in the large and diversified community served by the JCD.

2) There is a need for the various groups which influence educational decisions at the JCD to recognize and to take requisite steps to assure that as high a proportion as possible of students at the JCD enroll in courses and programs for which they are intellectually, economically, and motivationally suited. There is little question that too high a proportion of JCD students - and their parents as well- have

set unrealistic objectives for themselves which are frustrating the purposes and objectives of the JCD as stated by either its faculty or even the community itself.

There are a number of alternative solutions which could be offered in this area, but the following would appear to be among the most practicable.

(a) Given that the JCD is committed to an "open-door" policy, there follows the necessity to develop some type of standards or criteria - such as test scores or high school class rankings - by which the weakest students can be channelled into developmental (remedial) education. Those with less traditional academic orientation but with either greater dexterity or mechanical ingenuity and imagination could be better counseled into technical/vocational education in which they have a reasonable chance to succeed. In this regard, a formal program of developmental (remedial) education probably is also needed at the Meramec and Florissant Valley campuses, where such programs do not currently exist on a fully organized basis. In fact, the data would support a larger JCD remedial program than the 10 percent of resources visualized by the JCD faculty and counselors as the proper limit. Unless some standards are developed by which the most deficient students can have their deficiencies removed and then channelled into programs for which they are at least reasonably suited, it would appear that the "open-door" policy of the institution becomes less meaningful and not realistic and will continue to cause considerable frustration. Unless some methods for facilitation of more rationally based choices can be found, this major problem will be a continuing one that will frustrate many faculty, counselors, and administrators who are vitally concerned with the future course of the JCD.

(b) It is recognized by the authors that the availability and improvement of additional technical/vocational programs and facilities may attract increasing numbers of JCD students to such programs. However, in the interval between the time that sufficient technical/vocational programs become available and/or standards for screening students are developed, the major hope for guiding students into technical/vocational education must come through the facilities of the JCD counseling services. There appears to be a need for additional counseling and more counseling services at each JCD campus, so that students may have ready and continued accessibility to individual counseling that is tailored to their specific needs. It also becomes imperative that such JCD counseling becomes much more directive in nature than it apparently has hitherto been. By directive, the authors mean that the counselors must become willing to strongly urge certain choices upon students which they deem more suitable and which lead to enrollment in remedial or technical/vocational programs, if they have strong evidence and convictions that the students' likelihood for success at the JCD is limited in the college transfer curriculum.

JCD faculty also should be encouraged to assist the JCD counselors by whatever means are appropriate in order to effectively guide students into programs and courses consonant with the students' achievement capabilities.

(c) At the other extremity of the academic continuum, the simple facts of life are that for the immediate foreseeable future, the majority of the JCD student body will be enrolled in college transfer programs. Given the nature of the JCD student body - including the availability to them of financial resources - a large if not dispropor-

tionate majority of the successful JCD graduates will attempt to enroll in nearby state universities and colleges. A high degree of liaison with state university and college officials by all JCD groups concerned - especially faculty and counselors - would seem to be indicated, since the JCD curriculum increasingly will be, as it already has been, necessarily planned with the requirements of state systems in mind. This liaison and co-ordination is a vital necessity in order to prevent inordinately high failure rates of community college transfer students, which in at least one major state university and college system is known to be in excess of 50 percent.

3) There is an apparent need for the JCD to develop closer and detailed liaison with the high school counselors of the metropolitan St. Louis area high schools. This need for liaison and greater information-sharing also might well be extended to high school faculty and high school administrators, even to the point of providing for visitations to the JCD campuses on periodic occasions. Despite the strong efforts of the JCD to inform the high schools concerning the objectives and programs available at the JCD, there still appears to be an "information gap" that needs to be bridged if high school counselors and other high school personnel are to operate more effectively in their JCD counseling efforts.

Along these same lines, it would be desirable for JCD counselors to inform and encourage high school counselors to be more directive in their counseling of students concerning technical/vocational fields. It must be conveyed to high school students even before they enroll at the JCD that technical/vocational education is not a "dumping ground" for the least competent intellectually, and that technical/vocational programs

offer many opportunities for challenging and interesting careers.

The whole problem area of high school counseling - as highlighted by this research - needs much more intensive specialized research than this broad gauged study could provide. The data from this study strongly indicate that counseling in the high schools is inadequate to the individual needs of certain students. It becomes imperative, therefore, not only that methods leading to more optimal use of existing counseling facilities be developed, but also that more counseling resources be provided if students are to be advised realistically as to college and career choices. The Junior College District of St. Louis - St. Louis County, as well as community colleges elsewhere, have a vital stake in high school counseling programs, and they would be well advised to allocate funds and/or effort into comprehensive research concerning the efficacy of counseling both in the high schools and at the JCD.

4) It should be recognized that substantial proportions of students in programs that are conceived as terminal technical/vocational ones regard themselves as being in the first two years of a college or university professional transfer program. Thus, many of the successful "graduates" from these programs are likely to "leak" out of the technician and middle-manpower fields for which they were trained. Consequently, technical/vocational programs may have to be substantially larger than otherwise indicated in order to provide the community with the numbers of technicians or middle-manpower personnel for which the programs ostensibly were established. The JCD policy choices involved are whether to give higher priority to those technical/vocational programs which more easily can be kept terminal in nature, or to allow "free choice" and consumer sovereignty in the determination of size of technical/vocational

programs and the order in which they are installed. These are decisions which cannot be made solely on an economic basis by the JCD. At the same time, it must also be recognized that if the proportions of JCD students in technical/vocational education are to be expanded to the levels suggested by JCD faculty and counselors, then a substantial increase in costs must be anticipated. Certain types of technical/vocational education are as much as three to four times more costly per student than is "liberal arts" education. Therefore, it would be unrealistic to assume that any major increases in proportions of JCD students enrolled in technical/vocational education can be attained without substantial increases in costs per student. Such potential added costs must be emphasized to the community and planned for accordingly, if technical/vocational education is to be expanded to the levels desired by the JCD and which are in line with servicing community technician and middle-manpower needs.

5) There appears to be a need to bring parents of JCD students into a closer relationship with the JCD, since the data indicate that most parents currently are generally uninformed and have little or no contact with the JCD. Certainly, if JCD students are to receive helpful advice in their homes concerning various courses and basic alternatives involved in different programs, it would be to the advantage of the JCD to make every effort to keep parents well informed as to the kinds of career opportunities that are implicit in technical/vocational programs and other curricula.

Most of the parents appear to appreciate the existence of the JCD, and the fact that their son or daughter is in attendance. Since parents tend to have these overall favorable attitudes, many of them

would be receptive to receiving more detailed information and first hand knowledge of the programs at the JCD, so that at least some of them would be helpful in advising their children as to realistic course and career choices. The specifics for accomplishing closer liaison with parents are manifold, and do not require listing here.

6) Finally, the administration of the Junior College District, in formulating stated policy objectives which will be used to plan the programs and the development of campuses during the next 5 to 10 years, should seek to have a strong representation of JCD faculty and JCD counselors participate in the outlining of JCD goals and policies as well as in the determination of curricula and course content. Perhaps the most pressing reason for this involves the JCD faculty itself. The amount of ambivalence stated in the interviews with JCD faculty, JCD counselors and departmental administrators is something which is not to be unexpected, but one which nevertheless should now be confronted. The JCD faculty appears to be somewhat divided,or at least find it difficult to verbalize their feelings, as to just exactly what they think the JCD should be or in what direction it should go.

There appears to be a lack of identity in the minds of some of the faculty with the idea of a community college. Many of them appear to have a view of the academic ideal which is clearly identified with the universities and colleges from which they did their graduate work, and either they do not really feel that they are professionals in the college or university sense of the word, or they feel that they are in the "academic bushes" at a level considerably beneath themselves. Perhaps the necessary initial emphases upon buildings, program and curricula development, recruitment of the proper numbers of students and faculty, public

relations, etc., necessarily had precedence over efforts to establish the proper faculty "esprit de corps" and adequate channels of communication and participation. Thus, significant numbers of faculty expressed sentiments indicating that they felt more akin to being employees, rather than autonomous members of a self-governing body of scholars who established the tone of the institution of which they are integral parts.

Time will possibly rectify much of this dichotomy, but in the short term, anything that could be done to further develop and enhance an "esprit de corps" or identity among the JCD faculty as being part of a new, dynamic, and different but highly exciting educational community would serve to mitigate the substantial degree of ambivalence which currently exists. The greater degree of involvement of JCD faculty in the development and constant redevelopment of goals, objectives, and programs of the school would be a major help in bringing the JCD faculty to recognize the unique and dynamic type of entity that their institution actually represents.